



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1410
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,801	06/29/2001	Larry Brown	41992-00427	5589

7590 06/01/2006
MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, CO 80014

EXAMINER

ABYANEH, ALI S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,801

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Ali S. Abyaneh

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04-25-2006 has been entered.

2. Claims 13-20 and 30 are pending.
3. Claims 1-12 and 21-29 are cancelled.
4. Claim 30 is newly added.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's amendments/arguments filed on 04-25-2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fahlman et al. (US Patent NO.5, 960,080) in view of Thuraishingham et al. (US Patent NO.5,355,474).

Regarding Claim 13, 14, 15

Fahlman teaches a method for use in a multi-level secure system for sanitizing a message, said multi-level secure system including at least first and second security levels wherein first security level users are authorized to receive sensitive information that second security level users are not authorized to receive, said method comprising the steps of: establishing a computer-based sanitization tool for sanitizing messages based on predefined sanitization rules (column 4, lines 17-64, column 5, lines 1-40); first using said computer-based sanitization tool for receiving a message for potential distribution;(column 4, lines 20-22), third operating said computer-based sanitization tool for sanitizing said received message to generate first sanitized message for transmission to said first potential recipient (column 4, lines 20-46) and fourth operating said computer-based sanitation tool for sanitizing said received message to generate a second sanitized message, different than the first sanitized message, for transmission to said second potential recipient. (column 4, lines 20-67 and column5, lines 1-28); protecting first and second sensitive information such that first sensitive information is not useable by first potential recipient and second sensitive information is not usable by second potential recipient(column 4, lines

46-53). Fahlman does not explicitly teach second operating said computer-based sanitization tool for identifying at least first and second potential recipients having first and second security clearances and identifying first and second sensitive information based on first and second security clearances and accessing storage including multiple rule sets, using parameters associated with first and second security clearances to select a first rule set, second rule set. However, in an analogous art, Thuraishingham teaches, identifying at least first and second potential recipients having first and second security clearances (column 8, lines 37-39) and identifying first and second sensitive information based on first and second security clearances and accessing storage including multiple rule sets, using parameters associated with first and second security clearances to select a first rule set, second rule set (column 3, lines 10-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Fahlman to include identifying at least first and second potential recipients having first and second security clearances and identifying first and second sensitive information based on first and second security clearances and accessing storage including multiple rule sets, using parameters associated with first and second security clearances to select a first rule set, second rule set. This would have been obvious because person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so in order to control access to the data and furthermore to

ensure that only the data at or before the user's level is released (column 3, line 60-53).

Regarding Claim 16

Fahlman and Thuraingham teach all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 13 above. Fahlman furthermore teaches a method, wherein said step of first using comprises receiving a text only message. (column 4, lines 22-24).

Regarding claim 17

Fahlman and Thuraingham teach all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 13 above. Fahlman furthermore teaches a method, wherein said message includes a graphics portion and said step of third operating comprises protecting sensitive information within said graphics portion such that said sensitive information is not useable by said first recipient. (column 4, lines 22-26,47-53).

Regarding Claim 18

Fahlman and Thuraingham teach all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 13 above. Fahlman furthermore teaches a method, wherein said step of third operating comprise parsing said message into a number of tokens and separately analyzing each token for sensitive information. (column 4, lines 37-45).

Regarding claim 19

Fahlman and Thuraishingham teach all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 13 above. Fahlman furthermore teaches a method, wherein said step of third operating comprises identifying a first format associated with said first potential recipient and converting said first sanitized message into said first format, and said step of fourth operating comprises identifying a second format associated with said second potential recipient and converting said second sanitized message into said second format. (column 3, lines 56-60, column 4, lines 64-65 and column 5, lines 1-17).

Regarding Claim 20

Fahlman and Thuraishingham teach all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 19 above. Fahlman furthermore teaches a method, further comprising the step of providing storage including first specification information for said first format and second specification information for said second format, where said step of third operating comprises accessing said storage to obtain said first specification information and said step of fourth operating comprises accessing said storage to obtain said second specification information, wherein said storage can be used to reconfigure said sanitization tool for transmission in multiple formats without re-compiling.(column 2, lines 43-56).

8. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thuraisingham et al. (US Patent NO.5,355,474) in view of Fahlman et al. (US Patent NO.5, 960,080).

Regarding Claim 30

Thuraisingham teaches a method for use in a multi-level secure system for sanitizing a message, said method comprising steps of: receiving an input file that includes information associated with at least first and second security levels of the multi-level secure system, wherein a user associated with said first security level of the multi-level secure system is entitled to receive information that a user associated with said second security level of the multi-level secure system is not entitled to receive; determining a security level associated with at least one user of the multi-level secure system to be said second security level (column 8, lines 30-40 and column 9 line 58-column 10, line 13); Thuraisingham does not explicitly teach parsing intelligible elements from the information of the input file; analyzing said intelligible elements to select a portion of the intelligible elements for sanitization according to the second security level; sanitizing the information of the selected portion of the intelligible elements according to the second security level to generate an output file for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system, wherein said output file has a first format; and formatting the output file to a second format for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system; and transferring the output file in the second format to said at least one user of the multi-level secure system. However, in an analogous art, Fahlman teaches

parsing intelligible elements from the information of the input file; analyzing said intelligible elements to select a portion of the intelligible elements for sanitization according to the second security level (column 4, lines 20-29); sanitizing the information of the selected portion of the intelligible elements according to the second security level to generate an output file for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system, wherein said output file has a first format ; and formatting the output file to a second format for said at least one user of the multi- level secure system; and transferring the output file in the second format to said at least one user of the multi-level secure system (column 4, lines 42-66).

Therefor it would have been obvious to person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by

Thuraisingham to include parsing intelligible elements from the information of the input file; analyzing said intelligible elements to select a portion of the intelligible elements for sanitization according to the second security level; sanitizing the information of the selected portion of the intelligible elements according to the second security level to generate an output file for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system, wherein said output file has a first format; and formatting the output file to a second format for said at least one user of the multi- level secure system; and transferring the output file in the second format to said at least one user of the multi-level secure system. This would have been obvious because person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently and securely transfer a message

containing sensitive information and furthermore to transform a message by separating information from the message prior to an entrusted service (column 1, line 67- column 2, line3).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Abyaneh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as (571) 273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ali Abyaneh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2137
05/25/06

AA
Emmanuel L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER